

intention of the minister is of the essence of sacrament."

Hooker says—"This is the error of all Popish definitions of the Church, that they define it not by what it essentially is, but by that wherein they imagine their own more perfect than the rest are." Bishop Sanderson says, in one of his well known sermons—"All who outwardly profess the faith and name of Christ are within the pale of the visible Church."

Hooker, Sanderson, Hopkins, and Onderdonk, all champions of the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, never thought of unchurching and leaving to the uncovenanted mercies of God the orthodox religious bodies around them, who were not episcopally constituted. If, then, I am inconsistent, as "Querist" thinks, I have the satisfaction to know that I am in remarkably good society, and am most willing to remain there. With regard to the mistiness of the meaning of one of my sentences, of which "Querist" complains, I leave a discerning public to decide, whether it consists in the haziness of my view, or the cloudiness of his perceptions.

E. DUVNET.

The Rectory, Chambly.

[To the Editor of the Church Guardian.]

SIR,—The following extracts from Sadler's "One Sacrifice" I send for Canon DuVernet's edification, and such as he who, while they hold really to the thing, vehemently repudiate the name of Sacerdotalists.

"Sacerdotalism," says my author in the Christian system, "can only be the claim to represent Christ." All who claim to exercise Sacerdotal or priestly functions claim to do so, simply because they suppose that when Christ said to the first ministers of the Church—"As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them," He meant those ministers to represent Himself by applying to men the merits of that sacrifice which He had just offered on the cross. Those who deny these sacerdotal powers must acknowledge—if they believe the New Testament at all—that Christ did at the first, send some persons to represent Him as His ministers, or ambassadors, or stewards, for some purposes of grace; but they say that Sacerdotalists claim to represent Him unduly, or in ways in which He gave to them no power to represent them. Now, a very little consideration will be sufficient to convince the reader that everyone who consecrates the Eucharistic elements, and administers what he has consecrated, by so doing claims to represent Christ in the most direct way possible. * * * * Whatever Holy good he distributes from the Altar or Table, he must do it as representing Christ; and if for no other reason for this, that it is undoubtedly the Lord's Table. No man can preside at another man's table, and give food from it to his guests, unless on the assumption that he specially represents the person to whom the table belongs. If it be in very deed the Lord's Table, He must feed us from it; and if the Lord be not visibly present, He must feed us by the hands of those whom He has appointed, just as when He fed the multitudes, He fed them by the hands of His Apostles.

All those who celebrate the Lord's Supper profess to give in it, as Christ's representatives, what He gave. If they believe He gave emblems only, they profess to give the same. If they believe that He gave something far greater than emblems, they profess to give the Greater Thing which they believe He gave. All branches of the Church Catholic which believe Christ has left a visible body, or organization believe that this function of representing Christ at His Altar or Table rests with the ministry of this body or organization. Those clergymen of the Church of England who, on platforms, declaim against Sacerdotalism and "Sacrificing Priests" in their own Churches, rigidly confine the actual celebration (*i.e.*, the reading of the Consecration Prayer, with the accompanying manual acts) to those who are in Priest's Orders. I never heard of their inviting the clerk or the Scripture reader, or some devout communicant to "do this." And yet it is clear that the only protest worth anything against Sacer-

dotalism which such persons can make is a practical protest of this sort. It seems worse than absurd to deny a priesthood in the Christian ministry, and yet to act as if there was a very exclusive one every time you celebrate the characteristic rite of the Gospel."

Here, I will pause, leaving the last paragraph to Canon DuVernet's calm consideration.

QUERIST.

(To the Editor of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—Mr. DuVernet is speaking more plainly, in very truth, and while heartily allowing him credit for thorough conscientiousness, I must, as a Catholic Churchman, under which title I am humbly contented to write, most emphatically dissent from his views. His rejoinder proves nothing. Irregularity, indulged in by no matter whom, can never form a precedent, or furnish authority for a practice. Admitting that in the years following the Reformation irregularities occurred, rendered inevitable by the unsettled state of affairs, and the ignorance of many in authority, does not the rubric quoted in my last letter shew that the Church in a formal and especial matter corrected the defect, and expressed clearly her mind on the matter?

It is idle for anybody to pretend not to see plainly the Church's position. The Church decreed in her article, "It is not lawful for any man to take on him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same." And added in her ordinal, "No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the United Church of England and Ireland, or suffered to execute any of the said function, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.

Is it possible that the S. P. G. could send out Lutheran missionaries, in the face of such plain statements as these, from the Prayer Book? What right have Bishops to transgress the laws of the Church, any more than Priests? In taking her position, the Anglican branch of the Church declared her conformity to Catholic usage. She retained carefully the Apostolic ministry, and as carefully kept intact her line of succession. Whatever else Hooker may have said, he certainly did say to the Dissenters of his day: "We require you to find out best one Church, upon the face of the whole earth, that hath been ordered by your discipline, or that hath not been ordered by ours; that is to say, by Episcopal regimen, since the Apostles." Whatever be Mr. du Vernet's idea of the Catholic Church, I would ask him who it was who enumerated the three Orders of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, and said to them: "Without these there is no Church." "Querist" will be able to defend himself, and shew us he can in a very few words, to which all the saints, and fathers and doctors of the Church from time immemorial will bear witness that "we have an Altar."

In conclusion, I should greatly like to hear more about the S. P. G. matter? Can the Bishops have possibly been guilty of so great a breach of order? I cannot easily believe it! It would be lawlessness, with which ritualistic law-breaking is a trifle compared.

"CATHOLICUS."

[We have given all sides a fair hearing, and now the discussion, so far as our columns are concerned, must, for the present at least, close.—Ed. C. G.]

IRREVERENCE AND SENSATIONALISM.

To the Editor of the Church Guardian.

SIR,—In glancing over the columns of a copy of the *New York Tribune* of Monday, 22nd May last, my eye fell upon the following:—

"MR. COLLYER'S TRIBUTE TO EMERSON.—The Rev. Robert Collyer spoke last (Sunday) night, in the Church of the Messiah, upon "Emerson." When he rose to begin his lecture he said: "I see P. T. Barnum sitting in a back pew of this church, and

I invite him to come forward and take a seat in my family pew. Mr. Barnum always gives me a good seat in his circus and I want to give him as good a one in my church." Mr. Barnum took the seat amid the smiles of the congregation. Mr. Collyer then began his lecture.

The irreverence and sensationalism here displayed is a natural outgrowth of the selfish worldly spirit of the age—a spirit which, while it seeks to degrade all religious service to the level of personal ease and fashionable enjoyment, nevertheless yearns for what is novel and startling. Is it not high time the attention of every Christian was called to the dangerous tendency of the age in which we live in the direction just indicated? We sorely need the energy wasted in promoting strife and division within the Church's fold to combat the insidious approaches of a common foe.

In the early days of Christianity the heathen world beheld the unselfish devotion of Christians one toward another with wonder and admiration. "Behold how these Christians love one another!" was the common cry. Lucian (himself a heathen) wrote "Quem admodum omnes inter se fratres essent."

To-day we have the not infrequent spectacle of a number of wealthy parishioners combining to erect an expensive and richly upholstered church, the cost perchance defrayed as follows: Freewill offerings of the congregation, 10 per cent; debentures, 50 per cent; debt, 40 per cent; the latter secured by mortgage or assumed by the congregation. This church is solemnly dedicated to the service of God, but individual selfishness adopts the pew system, and thus practically excludes the stranger and the poor. The next step is to secure, at a handsome salary, the services of a popular minister, whose reputation as a pulpit orator is wide-spread.

The work of the congregation being now supposed complete, it is prepared to sit in judgment upon the minister selected. Need we wonder that under such circumstances the minister of Christ is most dangerously tempted to win personal popularity and public distinction, by pandering to the spirit of worldiness that surrounds him. The tendency of the age is aptly illustrated in the internal arrangements of many (chiefly dissenting) places of worship which would seem especially intended to place in the foreground the creature rather than the Creator. The congregation occupy seats arranged in concentric circles. The "pastor" stands conspicuous as the common centre. Behind him on a raised platform he has as a background a perfect kaleidoscope of fashion, the choir. The congregation evidently regard the hymns and prayers as preliminaries. Their motive in coming was not to worship Almighty God but to hear Mr. B.'s sermon; and Mr. B.'s sermon, if it meets their approval, will consist of much that is novel and sensational. It will amuse them and send them home well pleased with themselves. As a natural consequence, Mr. B. finds himself deluged with delicate flattery. He lays himself out to please his congregation, and, succeeding, becomes their idol. Need we be surprised that under such circumstances with men like Mr. Collyer "the Church of the Messiah" becomes "my Church," in the same sense as Mr. Barnum would call his *Circus* "his!"

Whilst we are thankful that our own Church of England has always aimed at a high degree of reverence and decency, yet every one of her members ought most assuredly to be alive to this really serious danger that besets us to-day, for the selfish, sensational, worldly spirit, if unchecked in its advance, must eventually destroy all Christian humility and true devotion.

W. O. RAYMOND.

Stanley, 5th June, 1882.

A communication from "Rothesay" is respectfully declined, as its publication at the present time would do much more harm than good.

WE have been obliged to hold over several communications which will appear in our next, and we hope to present our readers with an enlarged and greatly improved paper next week.